



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 3, 1999

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

John F. Schlafly, Esq.
322 State Street
Suite 301
Alton, IL 62002

RE: MUR 4736
Eagle Forum PAC and
Margaret Gaul, as treasurer

Dear Mr. Schlafly:

As part of its consideration of Matter Under Review 4736, the Federal Election Commission ("the Commission") has found reason to believe that Eagle Forum PAC and Margaret Gaul, as treasurer, (referred to collectively hereinafter as "the Committee") violated 2 U.S.C. § 434 and § 441f, which are provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The Factual and Legal Analysis, which forms the basis for the Commission's findings, is attached for your information.

The facts underlying the Commission's findings in MUR 4736 are virtually identical to the basis for the Commission's June 1998 findings against the Committee in MURs 4568, 4633 and 4634. Due to the related nature of these MURs, the Commission has decided to investigate MUR 4736 concurrently with its investigation in MURs 4568, 4633 and 4634. Future communications regarding this MUR will refer to MURs 4568, 4633, 4634 and 4736 as being part of a single investigation.

For your information, this Office has considered and will treat the Committee's responses and submissions in MURs 4568, 4633 and 4634 as if they also had been filed in MUR 4736. You also may submit additional factual or legal materials that you believe are relevant to the Commission's consideration of this matter. Please submit such additional materials to the General Counsel's Office within 15 days of receipt of this letter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. In the absence of additional information, the Commission may find probable cause to believe that a violation has occurred and proceed with conciliation.

If you are interested in pursuing pre-probable cause conciliation, you should so request in writing. See 11 C.F.R. § 111.18(d). Upon receipt of the request, the Office of the General

28044200383

Eagle Forum PAC and
Margaret Gaul, as treasurer
MUR 4736
Page 2

Counsel will make recommendations to the Commission either proposing an agreement in settlement of the matter or recommending that pre-probable cause conciliation not be pursued. The Office of the General Counsel may recommend that pre-probable cause conciliation not be entered into at this time so that it may complete its investigation of the matter. Further, the Commission will not entertain requests for pre-probable cause conciliation after briefs on probable cause have been mailed to the respondent.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. §§ 437g(a)(4)(B) and 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public.

If you have any questions, please contact Mark Shonkwiler or Marianne Abely at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,



Scott E. Thomas
Chairman

Enclosures:
Factual and Legal Analysis

28044200384

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

RESPONDENTS: Eagle Forum
and Margaret Gaul, as treasurer

MUR: 4736

I. GENERATION OF THE MATTERS

The respondents were added to MUR 4736, which relates to the involvement of Triad Management Services, Inc. ("Triad") in various 1996 congressional elections, on the basis of information ascertained by the Commission in the normal course of its supervisory responsibilities. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(2).

The Commission currently is investigating similar allegations as part of an ongoing investigation in MURs 4568, 4633 and 4634. The Commission determined that it will investigate MUR 4736 jointly with MURs 4568, 4633 and MUR 4634.

II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

The Commission believes that the specific incidents recounted in the subject MURs are most appropriately viewed in the context of Triad's involvement in the 1996 election cycle. During the latter part of 1996 and throughout 1997, there were a number of press accounts concerning the activities of Triad in connection with these federal elections. In summary, it was reported that Triad came to the aid of a substantial number of Republican campaigns, including the Bob Riley for Congress committee and the Sam Brownback for U.S. Senate committee, after learning of their needs through a process it referred to as a "political audit."

The materials assembled thus far indicate that Triad's assistance may have encompassed setting up a plan to arrange contributions from certain individuals, who

28044200385

28044200386

already had made the maximum legal contribution to certain candidates, to various political action committees ("PACs"). These PACs reportedly then gave identical or nearly identical amounts back to the original contributor's preferred candidate.

The Commission has found reason to believe that during the 1996 election cycle, the Eagle Forum and Margaret Gaul, as treasurer, ("respondents") may have permitted the name of the PAC to be used by John and Ruth Stauffer ("the Stauffers") for the purpose of making a contribution to the Sam Brownback for U.S. Senate committee in the name of another. The Commission has also found reason to believe that the respondents may have failed to accurately report the nature of its receipts from the Stauffers and the contributions that it made to the Sam Brownback for U.S. Senate campaign.

Further, the Commission has found reason to believe that during the 1996 election cycle, the respondents may have permitted the name of the PAC to be used by Robert Riley, Jr. for the purpose of making a contribution to the Bob Riley for Congress committee in the name of another. The Commission has also found reason to believe that the respondents may have failed to accurately report the nature of its receipts from Mr. Riley and the contributions that it made to the Bob Riley for Congress campaign.

28044200387

A. THE APPLICABLE LAW

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, ("the Act") prohibits persons from allowing their names to be used to effect a contribution in the name of another. 2 U.S.C. § 441f. The Act also requires any organization that qualifies as a political committee, including an unconnected committee, to file periodic reports of receipts and disbursements with the Commission. 2 U.S.C. § 434.

B. FACTS

1. Triad

Triad appears to have been created during the 1996 election cycle. Triad reportedly was founded by Carolyn Malenick, who previously had worked as a fundraiser for various political groups and campaigns, including, *inter alia*, Oliver North's 1994 bid for the US Senate. At different times, Ms. Malenick reportedly has described herself as the President and Chief Executive Officer of Triad; the Director of Triad; and the Chief Operating Officer of Triad. *See, e.g.*, 11/19/97 Carolyn Malenick letter-to-the-editor of the Dayton Daily News.

Triad advertises itself as a political consulting firm that provides services to donors interested in making political contributions to conservative candidates, campaigns, issues and projects. *See* Undated Triad Advertisement. Triad attempts to distinguish itself from other political consulting firms by claiming that it only works for donors, not for candidates or campaigns. *Id.*

Press accounts indicate that Triad representatives have described the company as operating in a manner akin to a stock brokerage for conservative political donors, providing research and analysis of upcoming elections, and dispensing advice on how to

maximize the impact of political contributions. See 9/28/96 National Journal article. In sum, Triad reportedly seeks to give wealthy contributors advice on how to get the "biggest bang for the buck" with their contributions by telling them which conservative candidates look like winners and which ones need help. *Id.*

2. Triad's Political Audits

At least one news account has reported that Triad personnel and consultants performed what Triad labeled as "political audits" on approximately 250 campaigns during the 1996 election cycle. See 10/29/97 Minneapolis Star-Tribune article. This news account also reported that a Triad spokesperson described the purpose of these political audits, many of which reportedly included meetings with the candidate or senior campaign officials, as the identification of "races where donors could support candidates who shared their ideological views and had a viable campaign." *Id.*

The political audit reports released as exhibits to the Final Report on Investigation of Illegal or Improper Activities in Connection with 1996 Federal Election Campaigns by the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs ("Senate Report") suggest that Triad conducted a standardized review of congressional campaigns. The first point reflected in many of these audit reports was a date on which a Triad representative met with someone from the campaign to obtain the information contained in the audit. Most of the audit reports included as Exhibits to the Senate Report followed a standard format discussing some or all of the topics listed below.

FORMAT OF TRIAD "POLITICAL AUDIT" REPORT

- I. Finances - (assessment of planned expenditures, current cash-on-hand and possible fundraising shortfalls)

- II. Polling - (review of polling trends in race)
- III. Key Issues - (list of issues considered critical to the campaign's success)
- IV. Needs - (campaign's self-identification of specific nonmonetary needs; e.g., big name speaker to attract supporters to rally)

General Observations (Comments on campaign organizations)

Good Points about Campaign - (Subjective analysis of strengths)

Bad Points about Campaign - (Subjective analysis of weaknesses)

Prospect for Victory - (Assessment of Candidate's Chance to Win)

Action - (Follow-up Actions for Triad personnel)

Conclusion (Recommendation on support for campaign)

See, e.g., Triad political audit reports attached to Senate Report.

Indeed, it appears that as part of these audits, Triad met with representatives from each of the campaigns specifically addressed by the MURs, including the Bob Riley for Congress Committee and the Sam Brownback for U.S. Senate committee, to discuss the specific strengths and weaknesses of their campaign, and to learn what help the campaign needed to successfully compete in the upcoming election. Information obtained by the Commission suggests that in some instances, after completing an audit, Triad may have had ongoing contacts with some campaigns to assess their developing prospects and needs.

After completing its political audit on a campaign, including the Riley and Brownback committees, Triad reportedly provided the results of its research and analysis to prospective political donors. It appears that rather than waiting for donors to make specific requests for information about a particular campaign, Triad periodically sent

28044200390

general "Fax Alerts" to prospective donors which extolled the virtues of various campaigns and provided Triad's recommendations for political contributions. Based on documents attached as exhibits to the Senate reports, it appears that Triad sent no fewer than sixty (60) separate fax alerts between February and December 1996. *See* Triad Fax Alert Index. Further, while the Commission currently lacks information as to how many potential contributors received each Triad Fax Alert, one of the fax alerts in the middle of the known range (No. 28 out of 60) notes that "over 160 businessmen and women have been added to the Fax Alert in the last 18 months." *See* 10/10/96 Triad Fax Alert titled "Countdown to Election Day: 27 Days."

As discussed below, Triad appears to have used the information derived from its "political audits" in a number of different ways that may have resulted in excessive, prohibited and/or unreported in-kind contributions to the Sam Brownback for U.S. Senate campaign.

2. Triad's Fundraising Efforts

It appears from the text of the audits attached as exhibits to the Senate report and from examples of the solicitations set forth in what Triad called "Fax Alerts," that the audits were also a source of information based on which Triad decided where to focus its fundraising resources. The Triad Fax Alerts urge the recipients to make contributions and otherwise support various Triad-recommended candidates in both the primary and general elections. *See* Triad Fax Alerts attached to Senate Report. The Sam Brownback for U.S. Senate committee and the Bob Riley for Congress Committee are mentioned in several of the Triad Fax Alerts.

28044200391

Some of the audit reports refer to what appears to have been a practice Triad had of soliciting donors who already had made the maximum legal contribution to particular candidates Triad was seeking to support. In addition, certain of these reports seem to indicate that Triad may have tried to interest such donors in making contributions to certain selected political action committees, which made subsequent, and often identical, contributions to the original donor's preferred candidate(s).¹

For example, an excerpt from the Triad audit report of the campaign of Pete Sessions, which is attached to the Senate Minority report, states: "[b]oth Sessions and [the campaign manager] clearly understand the Triad concept and will have a list of their maxed out donors for our inspection as soon as there is a call from Washington." See excerpt from Pete Sessions audit report. Another audit report states that "Ed Merritt has a number of maxed out donors who might want to be introduced to Triad. Towards that end, I have recommended over the telephone to [a Triad employee] that we check out their receptance." See Ed Merritt audit report. In what appears to be reference to the same practice, the Triad audit report on the Sam Brownback for US Senate campaign, notes that Triad will "[n]eed to work with potential clients that may be recommended by the Brownback campaign and with the finance chairman to ensure that Triad is properly advertised." See Brownback audit report.

¹ It has been reported that Ms. Malenick acknowledged that Triad would try and match donors referred to it by a candidate to PACs who were likely to support the same candidate, but denied that there was any coordination between the individual contribution to the PACs and the PAC contributions to the candidate. See October 8, 1997 Article in The Hill. Triad's advertisements seem to hint at this by stating that its "services to clients" include "[w]orking with conservative political action committees and issue organizations for efforts to maximize their separate funding sources to accomplish common objectives."

28044200392

It was in this context that Robert Riley, Jr.,² who had already donated the maximum legal amount of money to the Bob Riley for Congress committee, made \$5000 in contributions to five PACs, which within a short time, made identical or nearly identical contributions to the Riley campaign.

Robert Riley, Jr. sent Triad a \$1,000 check dated May 9, 1996 and made out to the Eagle Forum. This check was forwarded to the respondent, Eagle Forum on May 10, 1996. (The PAC's financial disclosure filings state that the money was received on July 12, 1996.) The respondent organization made one \$1,000 donation and two \$500 donations to the Bob Riley for Congress campaign. These donations were sent to the campaign on June 16, 1996, July 29, 1996 and September 11, 1996 respectively.

Name of PAC	Date of Contribution by Riley, Jr.	Amount of Contribution by Riley, Jr.	Date of PAC Contribution to Campaign	Amount of PAC Contribution to Campaign
Eagle Forum	7/12/96 ⁴	\$1000	6/16/96 7/29/96 9/11/96	\$1000 \$500 \$500

John and Ruth Stauffer, who had given the maximum allowable amount of money to the Sam Brownback campaign, made \$32,500 in donations to seven PACs. Within a

² Robert Riley, Jr. is the son of the candidate, Robert R. Riley.

³ The reported date of the contribution is based on the date of receipt reported by the PACs. Robert Riley, Jr. reportedly wrote the checks for all five contributions on May 9, 1996 and Triad forwarded all five checks to the different PACs with cover letters dated May 10, 1996.

⁴ The record does not offer any explanation for why the Eagle Forum did not report receiving this contribution until more than two months after it reportedly was mailed.

short period of time these PACs made identical or nearly identical contributions to the Brownback committee.⁵

On July 10, 1996, the respondent PAC received a \$5,000 check from the Stauffers through Triad. On July 2, 1996, the Eagle Forum contributed \$4,000 to the Sam Brownback for U.S. Senate committee. The PAC then made three separate contributions of \$1,000 to the campaign on the following dates: September 11, 1996; October 11, 1996; and October 25, 1996

Name of PAC	Date of Stauffers' Contribution	Amount of Stauffers' Contribution	Date of PAC Contribution to Brownback	Amount of PAC Contribution to Brownback
Eagle Forum PAC	7/10/96	\$5000	7/02/96	\$4000
			9/11/96	\$1000
			10/11/96	\$1000
			10/25/96	\$1000

C. ANALYSIS

Based on the information available at this time, the Commission has found reason to believe that the Eagle Forum and Margaret Gaul, as treasurer, may have permitted the name of the PAC to be used by Robert Riley, Jr. for the purpose of making a contribution to the Bob Riley for Congress committee in the name of another person. By allowing the PAC's name to be so used, the respondents appear to have violated 2 U.S.C. § 441f.

Based on the available materials, the Commission found reason to believe that the respondents violated 2 U.S.C. § 434 by failing to accurately report the nature of the

⁵ John and Ruth Stauffer are the parents of Sam Brownback's wife.

PAC's receipts from Robert Riley, Jr. and its own contributions to the Bob Riley for Congress Committee.

There are several reasons for believing that the respondents may have violated the election law. As noted, documents attached as exhibits to the Senate reports appear to indicate that Triad had a practice of asking campaigns that Triad decided to support for lists of their "maxed out" donors. At this time, there is no other explanation for the proximity in timing and similarity in amounts between the contributions to the PACs and subsequent PAC contributions to the Riley and Brownback committees.

Robert Riley, Jr. had never before donated to this organization. And while the respondent PAC was entitled to give up to \$5,000.00 to the campaign, the total amount donated was close to that of Mr. Riley's contribution. The data currently available indicates that Triad had communications with both the contributor and with its recommended PAC, i.e., the Eagle Forum. These communications created an opportunity for the PAC to have agreed to make a contribution to a specific candidate, in this case Sam Brownback, in an amount close to the contribution that they received through Triad.

In MUR 4633, the respondents submitted a response that denied the allegation that original contributor funds that been funneled through the PAC to the recipient campaign. Notwithstanding the respondents' conclusory denials, the Commission believes that there are substantial unanswered questions regarding these contributions.

The factors outlined herein caused the Commission to find reason to believe that the Eagle Forum and Margaret Gaul, as treasurer, violated the Act. Specifically, the

⁶ The reported date of the contribution is based on the date of receipt reported by the PACs.

Commission has found reason to believe that the respondents violated 2 U.S.C. § 441f by allowing the name of the PAC to be used by Robert Riley, Jr. for the purpose of making contributions in the name of another. The Commission also found reason to believe that the respondents violated 2 U.S.C. § 434 by failing to accurately report the nature of its receipts from Robert Riley, Jr. and its contribution to the Bob Riley for Congress Committee.

The reasons for believing that the respondents may have violated the law with respect to the donations made by the Stauffers can be summarized as follows. Neither of the Stauffers had ever before contributed to the respondent PAC. And while the respondent PAC was entitled to give up to \$5,000.00 to the campaign, the total amount donated was close to that of the Stauffers' contribution. In addition, although the couple could have contributed up to \$5,000 each to this PAC, they limited the total aggregate contribution to the maximum amount the Eagle Forum was entitled to contribute to the Brownback committee. The data currently available indicates that Triad had communications with both the contributors and with its recommended PAC, the Eagle Forum, through which the donation to Sam Brownback for U.S. Senate passed. These communications created an opportunity for the PAC to have agreed to make a contribution to a specific candidate, in this case Sam Brownback, in an amount close to the contribution that they received from a Triad client, in this case the candidate's in-laws.

In MUR 4634, the respondents submitted a response that denied the allegation that original contributor funds that been funneled through the PAC to the recipient

campaign. Notwithstanding the respondents' conclusory denials, the Commission believes that there are substantial unanswered questions regarding these contributions.

The factors outlined herein prompted the Commission to find reason to believe that the Eagle Forum and Margaret Gaul, as treasurer, violated the Act, as amended. Specifically, the Commission found reason to believe that the respondents violated 2 U.S.C. § 441f by allowing the name of the PAC to be used by the Stauffers for the purpose of making contributions in the name of another. The Commission also found reason to believe that the respondents violated 2 U.S.C. § 434 by failing to accurately report the nature of its receipts from the Stauffers and its own contributions to the Sam Brownback for U.S. Senate committee.